UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/771,887	02/04/2004	Charles H. Perrone JR.	ZIM0587	3884
	7590 12/23/201 <b>HNOLOGY - BAKER</b>			IINER
111 EAST WAYNE STREET, SUITE 800 FORT WAYNE, IN 46802			SCHILLINGER, ANN M	
FORT WATER	E, IIN 40802		ZIM0587 3884  EXAMINER  SCHILLINGER, ANN M  ART UNIT PAPER NUMB  3774  MAIL DATE DELIVERY MO	PAPER NUMBER
			3774	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/23/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/771,887	PERRONE ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ANN SCHILLINGER	3774	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address	s
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLANTING INCOME IN A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLANTING INCOME.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNION .136(a). In no event, however, may a red will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON the, cause the application to become AE	CATION.  eply be timely filed  ITHS from the mailing date of this commun BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
<ul> <li>1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 communication (s) filed on 14 communicat</li></ul>	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matt	·	its is
Disposition of Claims			
4)	awn from consideration.	cation.	
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) and a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination is objected to by the Examination is objected.	ccepted or b) objected to e drawing(s) be held in abeyar ection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.1	, ,
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documer  2. Certified copies of the priority documer  3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri  application from the International Bures  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in A fority documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	application No received in this National Stag	е
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application 	

Art Unit: 3774

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10-12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans et al. (US Pat. No. 6,660,039) in view of Keller (US Pub. No. 2004/0186584). Evans et al. discloses the following of the claimed invention: a first tibia base plate (13) comprising an upper surface, a lower surface and an outer perimeter side surface; an insert (28) comprising an upper surface (67), a lower surface and an outer perimeter side surface extending between said upper surface and said lower surface of said insert; a means/connector (18) rotatably connecting said insert to said first tibial plate; the plate and the insert having a first configuration that allows rotation, but no translation (col. 10, lines 31-44); and at least one removable pin (27). Please also see Figures 15, 19, and 22.

Evans et al. discloses the limitations of claims 2 and 18 in col. 11, lines 31-40.

Evans et al. discloses the limitations of claims 3 and 19 in col. 9, lines 62-65.

Evans et al. discloses the limitations of claims 6 and 22 in col. 3, lines 25-35.

Evans et al. discloses the limitations of claims 10 and 24 as shown in Figure 15.

Evans et al. discloses the limitations of claims 11, 12, 25, and 26 as shown in Figures 19 and 22.

Art Unit: 3774

However, Evans et al. does not teach a pin being located flush with the outer perimeter side surface. Keller teaches a knee prosthesis with its pin located on the outer perimeter in paragraph 0007 and claim 6 for the purpose of allowing easier instrument accessibility to the pin's location. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Evans et al. by moving the pin and its opening to the outer perimeter side surface in order to allow an instrument to more easily access the pin.

Claims 13 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans et al. in view of Keller, further in view of O'Neil et al. (US Pat. No. 6,306, 172). Evans et al., as modified by Keller, teaches the invention substantially as claimed, however, they do not teach a pin with a projection on it. O'Neil et al. teaches a tibial insert with a pin having a projection in col. 5, lines 21-46 for the purpose of preventing separation between the base plate and the insert. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Evans et al. and Keller by providing the pin with a projection in order to prevent separation between the base plate and the insert.

Claims 14 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans et al. in view of Keller, further in view of Hurlburt (US Pat. No. 5,658,344). Evans et al., as modified by Keller, teaches the invention substantially as claimed, however, they do not teach a pin made of metal. Hurlburt teaches a tibial insert with a pin made of metal in col. 6, lines 27-39 for the purpose of utilizing the material's strength. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Evans et al.

Art Unit: 3774

and Keller by making the pin of metal as taught by Hurlburt in order to utilize the material's strength.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/14/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant has amended the pending claims to remove functional language and to describe the pin as being able to engage the insert and the first tibia base plate. However, the new claim language still only describes the intended use of the pin. The language does not positively claim any limitations that further describe the structure of the claimed device.

Therefore, it is maintained that the combination of Evans et al. in view of Keller still reads on the claims, as the pin of Evans et al. would be capable of being in contact with the periphery of the insert and the base plate.

## Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/771,887 Page 5

Art Unit: 3774

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANN SCHILLINGER whose telephone number is (571)272-

6652. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. 9 a.m. to 4 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Isabella can be reached on (571) 272-4749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. S./ Examiner, Art Unit 3774

/Corrine M McDermott/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3738